

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
In re:

LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments
Antitrust Litigation.

This Document Applies to:

INDIVIDUAL CASES LISTED IN APPENDIX
-----X

NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

O R D E R

| |
|-----------------------------|
| 11-MD-2262 (NRB) |
| USDC SDNY |
| DOCUMENT |
| ELECTRONICALLY FILED |
| DOC #: |
| DATE FILED: 12/23/15 |


This Order responds to the Direct Action Plaintiffs' ("plaintiffs") letter of November 23, 2015 (ECF No. 1242), the defendants' responsive letter of December 10, 2015 (ECF No. 1253), and plaintiffs' reply letter of December 15, 2015 (ECF No. 1257). Plaintiffs have misread LIBOR IV, which was not an invitation to seek the discovery they now request. With respect to the location from which the LIBOR submission was transmitted or determined, LIBOR IV contemplated a geographical response: from what office was the submission made, and/or if the submitter was directed by another bank official, where was that official's office located? This question should have one or at most two straightforward answers and does not require the expansive discovery sought by plaintiffs.

With respect to the location from which the bonds were issued, it is not clear from plaintiffs' letter why the bond documents in plaintiffs' possession do not reveal the relevant

information. To the extent this information is publicly available, as defendants suggest, the parties should confer to identify the appropriate public sources.

Accordingly, plaintiffs' request for the discovery sought in Appendix A of their November 23, 2015 letter is denied.

Dated: New York, New York
December 23, 2015

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Naomi Reice Buchwald", written over a horizontal line.

NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX

| CASE NAME | CASE NO. |
|--|-----------------|
| In re Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation | 11-md-2262 |
| City of Riverside et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-0597 |
| County of San Mateo et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-0625 |
| East Bay Municipal Utility District v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-0626 |
| City of Richmond et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-0627 |
| County of San Diego v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-0667 |
| Amabile et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-1700 |
| Maragos v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-2297 |
| Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-3952 |
| Salix Capital US Inc. et al. v. Banc of America Securities LLC et al. | 13-cv-4018 |
| Regents of the University of California v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-5186 |
| County of Sonoma et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-5187 |
| San Diego Association of Governments v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-5221 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| CEMA Joint Venture v. RBS Citizens, N.A. et al. | 13-cv-5511 |
| County of Sacramento v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-5569 |
| City of Houston v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-5616 |
| Principal Funds, Inc. et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-6013 |
| Principal Financial Group, Inc. et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-6014 |
| City of Philadelphia v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-6020 |
| National Credit Union Administration Board v. Credit Suisse Group AG et al. | 13-cv-7394 |
| Federal National Mortgage Ass'n v. Barclays Bank plc et al. | 13-cv-7720 |
| County of Mendocino v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 13-cv-8644 |
| Darby Financial Products et al. v. Barclays Bank plc et al. | 13-cv-8799 |
| Triaxx Prime CDO 2006-1 Ltd. et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 14-cv-0146 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Co. et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 14-cv-1757 |
| Bay Area Toll Authority v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 14-cv-3094 |
| Prudential Investment Portfolios 2 et al. v. Bank of America Corp. et al. | 14-cv-4189 |